

THE ARMY RESERVES STRATEGY TO SUPPORT THE DOD IN 2025

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL MICHAEL C. PEETERS
United States Army Reserve

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2011

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 16-02-2011		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE The Army Reserves Strategy to Support the DOD in 2025				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel Michael C. Peeters				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Jerry Cashion Department of Military Strategy, Planning, and Operations				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT As our nation and the leadership in the Department of Defense transitions from continuous wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to re-setting the force, perspective must be given to the future manning, equipping, and missions of the Army Reserve Forces. For the past ten years the reserve forces transitioned from a ready reserve, prepared to augment the active component in a war in Europe, to an operational force, one that deploys, fights alongside the active duty, and carries a significant portion of the nation's requirement in the Global War on Terrorism. Many of the current army reserve Soldiers know no other world than train, deploy, re-set, and then redeploy. Is this the cycle for the next ten years, and if not, then what will the DOD demand of its' reserve forces?					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Operational Requirements for the Reserve Force					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 26	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

THE ARMY RESERVES STRATEGY TO SUPPORT THE DOD IN 2025

by

Lieutenant Colonel Michael C. Peeters
United States Army Reserve

Colonel Jerry Cashion
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Michael C. Peeters
TITLE: The Army Reserves Strategy to Support the DOD in 2025
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 16 February 2011 WORD COUNT: 5,388 PAGES: 26
KEY TERMS: Operational Requirements for the Reserve Force
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

As our nation and the leadership in the Department of Defense transitions from continuous wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to re-setting the force, perspective must be given to the future manning, equipping, and missions of the Army Reserve Forces. For the past ten years the reserve forces transitioned from a ready reserve, prepared to augment the active component in a war in Europe, to an operational force, one that deploys, fights alongside the active duty, and carries a significant portion of the nation's requirement in the Global War on Terrorism. Many of the current army reserve Soldiers know no other world than train, deploy, re-set, and then redeploy. Is this the cycle for the next ten years, and if not, then what will the DOD demand of its' reserve forces?

THE ARMY RESERVES STRATEGY TO SUPPORT THE DOD IN 2025

There exists a spirited debate to determine the evolution of the army reserve forces from a Strategic Reserve focused force, to an Operational Force, and the reserves role in supporting the Department of Defense force structure through 2025. The debate and all the participants attempt to determine exactly what roles and mission the guardsmen and the reservist will play in the 21st century and as they are integrated into the force as an operational reserve, what will their future missions and roles entail.¹ There are three fundamental areas that require review, and many more questions that must be answered for the reserves to develop and maintain their structure under an operational reserve force.

Strategy

First is discussion of the strategic reserve component with a review of determining if the reserve component should revert back to the cold war strategic reserve model that existed throughout the 1970's. Is this the most effective way to employ the reserves and did it support the requirements for the past decades? As we have learned in the past, disbanding the reserves and attempting to rebuild them encompasses enormous cost for the nation. Without specific guidance and priority on maintaining the reserve force core capabilities the historical tendency will be just that, to revert back to a strategic force that loses many of the core capabilities now inherent in the reserve component.²

Second is the evolution of the reserves from a strategic reserve, their participation and integration in operations for the past decade, and then the challenges facing the force if it converts the reserves to an operational force. Everyone agrees that

war fighting should remain the central focus of the Army. However, in the area of stability operations and partner building capacity, using the reserve components will maximize the strength of all the Military's components.³ Is this the best employment of the reserve force and will leveraging their capabilities make the force stronger?

Finally, the decision makers must consider all the competing requirements in maintaining reserve force readiness at a level capable of performing when called upon to deploy. For the reserves to develop and maintain an operational footing, many elements of our government must get in line with their support for the force. The armed forces are at a crossroads where balancing the force and maintaining its versatility will be important as decision makers develop the force structure between the active and reserve components.⁴ The time has arrived for laying the army reserves foundation and its future role within our nation's military forces. The army leadership recognizes the substantial improvement of today's reserve forces and expects that by leveraging the training and combat experience learned from repeated deployments the reserve components will fulfill their role as an equal partner in the United States armed forces structure. For the past ten years, the reserve forces transitioned from a ready reserve, prepared to augment the active component in a war in Europe, to an operational force, one that deploys, fights alongside the active duty, and carries a significant portion of the nation's requirement in the Global War on Terrorism. With over 700,000 reserve component soldiers serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Guard and Reserves are significant contributors to the nation's war efforts since 9/11 and over half are now combat veterans.⁵

With operations in Iraq winding down there will be fewer operational needs for the reserve forces to deploy, there will be cuts in requirements and the operational funding, and many of this generational army reserve may be left wondering what's next after continuous cycles of train, deploy, re-set, and then redeploy. What's next is the development of a vision for the future operating environment of the reserve forces.

Responsibility for Change

The Army Reserve leadership must deal with three fundamental issues to make this change a reality. First is to define the requirements for the reserve forces of the 21st century while fulfilling its current requirements.⁶ This definition must include a strategic communications plan that speaks to the reserve component as an integral part of the total army. Additionally it must emphasize the significant contributions and gains of the reserve forces while fighting during this era of persistent conflict.⁷

Second is to develop a focused vision by which to rally the reserve forces' leadership in order to affect change throughout the organization. This should include development of the proper force structure, consistent ARFORGEN planning, professional development opportunities, and resourcing that embraces the operational mindset.

Finally, the leadership must develop and follow a blueprint or model that facilitates major organizational change, positions the reserve forces for service into the 21st century, and ensures the successful integration of the reserve forces into the Department of Defense strategic plan. How does the Army Reserve leadership deal with the uncertainty created with the downsizing of reserve requirements? How do they forge the requirements for the reserve forces of the 21st century, and how does the

leadership transform major organizational change while fulfilling the current requirements of the reserve forces?

Defining reserve force requirements and the role of the reserves, as we move into the future, would be a good place to start. If the DOD struggles with the role of the reserves then more specific guidance within the QDR is important to specify the future roles and mission the DOD envisions for the reserve component so the reserve planners can focus on their specific requirements.⁸ Homeland Defense and specialized skills in cyber warfare can generally be found in the reserves, and this is a good starting point, however the DOD must recognize the specialty areas within the reserve forces that match the requirements for high demand skill sets rather than vaguely identifying the reserves as having specialty skills.⁹ This is an area the Army leadership must refine and once the force requirements are defined, the reserve leadership must create the leadership *buy-in* and develop the reserve forces vision and strategy requirements. Through a well thought out and developed plan the reserve component leadership must seek to communicate their vision while empowering the senior leaders across the reserve to take action that will affect the changes.

Finally the reserve forces leadership must be poised to exploit the initial gains and short term wins from the field and continue building off of the initial gains as they move towards their vision and strategy end game. It all sounds so simple, yet there are powerful and competing forces working against the leadership that continually work against the vision and change. Gaining and then maintaining momentum will be challenging for the leadership and with so much discussion on operationalizing the reserves, it will be important to define what exactly that means.

The Way Ahead

A Chief of the Army panel has recently defined the term Operational Reserve: “An operational reserve component (RC) consists of units identified, focused, resourced, and prepared for specific missions at home or abroad. RC units provide tailorable capabilities that are needed to meet diverse operational demands. RC units are accounted for in the Deployed Expeditionary Force (DEF) and Contingency Expeditionary Force (CEF) pools and will be prepared to deploy within schedule outlined in the Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) process.”¹⁰ This concept of an operational reserve has begun to appear in DOD policy for managing the reserves as a component of the operational force. However, changing DOD practices that recognize the shift from a strategic reserve to an operational force is still in motion. The Governmental Accounting Office determined as late as September 2009 there were gaps in supporting an operational concept. The services had not fully recognized the costs inherent in transitioning to an operational force and specifically had not established the equipping, manning, and training levels in any of their budgets.¹¹ Having a definition is a starting point; however there is still a lot of work left to ingrain this concept into a working reality. First would be a consideration of what the reserves model consisted of prior to this era of persistent conflict.

Was the Cold War strategic model a professional and cost effective design for managing the Reserve Component and should the Department of Defense begin transitioning the reserves back to a strategic force? The army of the 1980’s was built with one purpose, and one purpose only, to defeat the armies of the Soviet Union during an invasion of the European continent. The active component was expected to carry the initial stages of the fight and operate as a forward deployed force with substantial

armor, infantry, and artillery assets. The expectation was the reserve forces would be given a set amount of time to mobilize, train, and deploy and backfill the active duty forces to reinforce their war-fighting capacity. Much of this force generation model was mirrored after the World War II and Korean conflict and had continued as a result of the Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union.

This Cold War strategic model followed a pattern of reserve forces receiving extensive budget cuts and the reduction of reliance on the reserve forces. In addition the inherent tension between the active component and the reserves led most officials in the Pentagon to weigh in heavily on the side of the active forces.¹² This caused considerable disparity between the active and reserve components in areas of operational readiness, training budgets, equipment fielding initiatives, and budgetary allocation. Not only did this alienate the reserves and degrade their readiness for decades, but it also left them unprepared for combat operations without a significant investment in training, equipping, and personnel readiness. Our Nation must learn from our history and experiences and instead of rebuilding a dismantled force at a high cost, we must invest the resources wisely so we don't repeat the mistakes from the past.¹³

During Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm, the shortfalls in training and equipment readiness were embarrassingly exposed as reserve forces were required to mobilize more rapidly than planned and were ineffective in meeting simple training benchmarks, or brought outdated equipment to the fight. During the decades prior to 9/11 the reserve components were only allocated enough resources, money, and time to train approximately two days per month plus their two weeks of annual training; a woefully inadequate amount compared to the training tempo of their active duty

counterparts. Yet the expectation was the reserve forces could backfill their active force counterparts and conduct business to the level of an active duty force. During Desert Shield/Desert Storm, too many of the reserve forces reported to mobilization station inadequately trained and poorly equipped.

Allowing forces to be inadequately trained and poorly equipped will not be acceptable as our nation faces a determined enemy across many different spectrums¹⁴ and the army reserves will be expected to maintain a wider role and perform at a level equal to their active duty counterparts. ADM Mike Mullen, the chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff was very clear in the reserves future role: “allowing the Guard and Reserves to regress back to a Cold War-style strategic force meant only to be used as a last resort in the event of major war would be a tremendous mistake that would damage U.S. national security. In fact, the longer the U.S. government takes to fully transition the Guard and Reserves into an operational force for the future, the more likely it becomes that funding for doing so will vanish as the DOD budget flattens or contracts over the next five years.”¹⁵

As the department of defense looks to the future, the expectation is reserve forces will fully integrate into the active component day-to-day operations, maintain platoon and company level training proficiency, and report to their mobilization stations prepared to train collectively on theatre specific training requirements. Reserve forces will be expected to maximize their *boots on the ground* time by maintaining their training readiness, and a strategic model for reserve components fails to support the expectations of the reserves meeting the requirements of a trained and responsive force.

Strategic to Operational, an Evolution

As the Reserve forces evolve from a strategic to an operational force, can the reserves develop and maintain the capacity to mobilize and deploy on a cycle consistent with its' active duty counterpart? If so, what challenges will the reserve force face in the future and by drawing from the total army talent pool will they be able to meet these complex challenges to our nation's future? ¹⁶ The current Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, thinks so and believes an important part of the total pool includes the reserve forces. He believes the reserves must be capable of developing and maintaining the required levels of operability, and is directing requirements that support operationalizing the reserve forces. As the Department of Defense develops the armed forces footprint, much discussion centers on the force representing American Society. As Secretary Gates notes, "for a growing number of Americans, service in the military, no matter how laudable, has become something for other people to do."¹⁷ While that attitude may exist in some elements of the general public, across the reserve community there is strong support for the reserve force Soldier. In fact, while less than two tenths of a percent of the active component comes from our population, there are over 4,000 army guard and reserve and readiness centers strategically placed within our communities. When the guard and reserve are mobilized, they bring with them the support of their home towns and the people they live amongst on a day-to-day basis.¹⁸

In recent guidance from the Department of Defense, Secretary Gates outlines specific guidelines for managing the reserve components as an operational force. DOD Policy Directive NUMBER 1200.17 states: "This Directive establishes the overarching set of principles and policies to promote and support the management of the Reserve Components (RC) as an operational force."¹⁹ The current army leadership demands the

army reserves maintain its readiness, training, and equipping requirements while posturing itself as an integral part of today's combat ready forces. There is wide support across the military community for an operational force and many of the important decision makers are weighing into the discussion.

Former deputy chief of staff, G-3/5/7 LTG James Lovelace, believes the reserve components are an important element for maintaining the strategic depth of the armed forces and the reserve components have demonstrated unprecedented integration into the total force concept. He recognizes that since 9/11 there has been unparalleled integration of the total force not seen since World War II and that under the Secretary of the Army leadership, the reserve and the guard components have provided unprecedented access to reserve and guard forces.²⁰ LTG Lovelace also sews the seeds for maintaining the reserve forces as an operational entity and is working relentlessly to implement policies and procedures for operationalizing the reserve component. As the policies and procedures develop, LTG Lovelace has not forsaken the associated funding that supports the concept of supporting the reserve component as an operational force.²¹

Leadership within the reserve forces also demand a bigger share of benefits, training dollars, operational funding, and equipment fielding while arguing a whole generation of trained reservists cannot be put back on the shelf like a can of beans to be opened and used only when the nation calls. LTG Jack Stultz, Chief of the Army Reserve (CAR) says, "If the Reserve falls back and loses its operational mission, it will also lose the Soldiers who have signed up to do something and not just sit back and watch."²²

Sitting back and watching was something the reserve forces did for decades, but when the United States of America and her citizens were attacked, the reserves increased their operational tempo and mobilized to sustain U.S. global commitments. As the nation's defense requirements rose, so too did the contributions of the National Guard and Reserves. With requirements that were five times higher than pre 9/11, the guard and reserve soldiers made up more than 33 percent of all U.S. military forces in Iraq and increased their workload seven fold.²³ Evolving from those events, the Army Reserve has grown a generation of Soldiers who have trained, deployed and fought for their country, and now want to maintain a more active role in defending their nation.

Evolving is what the reserve forces have done, and in January of 2008, the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves submitted their strategic planning recommendations to Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, and outlined the reserve forces roles and how best to use the reserve components to achieve national security objectives. "*Transforming the National Guard and Reserves in a 21st-Century Operational Force* contains six major conclusions and 95 recommendations, supported by 163 findings. As Congress envisioned, the most comprehensive independent review of the National Guard and Reserve forces in the past 60 years will be complete, and the burden for action will fall to the legislative and executive branches."²⁴ The questions now become what actions are required and will the legislative and executive branches support them?

Roles of the Reserves

The reserve components resource, equip, and train to perform operational roles in peacetime, wartime, for contingencies, domestic demands, and now homeland defense. The expectation is that the services train and resource their Guard and

Reserve counterparts to the same standards as their active components. That means providing the institutional access, resources, and facilities, to maintain individual as well as unit level proficiencies and develop the strategic depth and operational capabilities expected when tasked with homeland defense or Defense Support to Civil Authorities.²⁵ The question asked by policy makers is what missions will the reserve forces perform in an operational role? The answer to the question may best be defined by what are the mission requirements.

Certainly homeland defense has garnered major focus in the last decade and has evolved into a fundamental piece of the national defense puzzle. A look into the future is embedded in elements of the National Defense Panel Review where the Hart Rudman Commission was a precursor to the elements of the National Defense Panel review. The overarching idea was to develop operational flexibility in a 1947 era bureaucracy but still anticipate future security challenges facing the United States. In the end, the commission endorsed the National Guard as the primary proponent of the Homeland Security mission.²⁶ Embedded in the homeland defense is the Defense Support to Civil Authorities, or DSCA, for short. The DSCA capabilities are critical when responding to overwhelming events that affect our nation's citizens. These include responding to natural disasters, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and fires; all areas the reserve forces have excelled, and can continue to excel. In addition the state partnership programs for many of the National Guard units are a proven and valuable compliment to the theatre engagement strategy programs. However, in an era of persistent conflict, the underlying expectation is much more than the traditional roles for the reserve forces.

The recently implemented ARFORGEN model attempts to bring some level of predictability to forces and their deployment cycles. Actively integrating the reserves in the ARFORGEN model requires preparation, resourcing, training, and new equipment fielding so the reserves can be available on a planned calendar rotation. Currently the ARFORGEN model plans for the rotation of the active component once every three years and the reserve force once every five years. The challenge for the reserve forces will be in fielding the most updated equipment and finding the training time to maintain their operational proficiencies. A key component involves being resourced from a base resourcing rather than a contingency resource since OCO resourcing is a main revenue source for today's missions but cannot sustain the force facing budgetary constraints.²⁷ Assistant Secretary of the Army, Tom Lamont, echoed these thoughts at a recent AUSA conference in Washington, stating that is obvious in today's environment that the army needs a more cost effective total force that integrates the reserve components. The war time experience of a majority of the reserve forces validates the institutionalizing of policies, procedures, and more importantly legislation. He also adds the importance of shifting resources from a contingency funding source to a base funding source is paramount to achieving efficiencies across the total force.²⁸

For the past decade, the Department of Defense has enjoyed a substantial increase in its operational and contingency funding. Most suspect this funding will begin to dry up and predict transitioning more to operating in a constrained resource environment. When the services begin to lose their funding and face decisions between active and reserve forces, many on the reserve side believe the reserves will be the loser in the budgetary resourcing arena, unless the base resourcing is first established.

When you take into consideration the training side of the equation, unless the DOD revamps the available training days for the reserve forces, the reserves will continue to operate under a *one weekend a month, two weeks a year* constraint.

Training and Maintaining the Force

The training equation is as important as the resourcing equation and no one has offered any solutions or appears ready to drill down into the time requirements for maintaining the reserve force readiness. If we take a moment and consider the amount of time an active component unit trains vs. a reserve component, does anyone really believe the reserves can maintain a reserve force proficient at the platoon and company level without substantial investment in additional training days. Even if training days are added, will employers continue to support additional days off for their reserve force Soldiers while being forced to balance their ability to run an organization? Current laws support the reserve force Soldier to a certain level, however a massive restructuring of the laws supporting reserve Soldiers must certainly be reviewed if additional yearly training days are added.

Let's consider for a moment the task of achieving platoon and company level proficiency for any of the combat arms organizations and the amount of time required to complete the training to standard. For ease of comparison, let's simply look at a standard infantry battalion, and achieving platoon level proficiency in a live fire training environment. The initial building block requires all of the Soldiers to train and qualify on their individual weapon systems before beginning their collective training. An individual Soldier spends approximately 40 hours preparing to qualify on his weapon prior to going to the range; this is referred to as primary marksmanship instruction, or PMI.

The Soldier goes through a multitude of tasks for use of the weapon system and then trains on the various optics associated with their weapon. A standard infantry Soldier has an M4, equipped with a laser designator, usually a PEQ-15, and some sort of optics for sight picture. The weapon requires mechanical sight zero and then a zero sighting for the optics. Each of the leadership spends at least the same amount of time validating their training abilities, resourcing the requirements, setting the conditions, and prepping for execution. Between the leadership and the individual Soldier there is approximately 50 hours invested in preparing for individual weapons qualification. All of the Soldiers then come together and move out to an established range, execute the day, transition, nuclear/biological/chemical (NBC), and night fire training requirements for each of the individual firers.

Executing the ranges takes the collective effort of all involved and considering all four of the requirements, the Soldiers are generally on the range for four to six days depending on the leadership emphasis on training vs. qualifying. All total, for simply executing the first event in the platoon level live fire, training is approximately ten days. Following the weapons qualification, all of the Soldiers go through a building block of training for their live fire exercise.

Each of the teams, approximately 4 Soldiers, conduct a walk through, dry fire, blank fire, and then a live fire training event. Once the team live fire is validated, the Soldiers move into a squad event and conduct the same walk through using the dry, blank, and then live fire training scenario. Eventually the unit moves to a platoon level event and *could* culminate with a company level live fire event. A company level live fire is a comprehensive, intensive, training event and a unit must spend weeks preparing to

execute a live fire event at the company level. Given the amount of time available, the myriad of other training requirements, and the allocated training time, any reserve forces unit would be hard pressed to maintain platoon let alone company level proficiency.

With a reserve force that has two days a month and two weeks a year, the training requirement to maintain platoon and company level proficiency does not match the training time available for reserve component Soldiers. Maintaining platoon and company level proficiency for reserve forces is not sustainable and really should be focused more on squad level proficiency. Reserve forces have the ability to train to squad level proficiency and can move into platoon and company level proficiency once they transition to the mobilization station. The move from squad to platoon level proficiency is generally achievable if the initial building blocks at the individual and squad level are trained to standard. Once the reserve component is at the desired proficiency level they can be added as strategic depth to the active component.

Even if training days are added, will employers continue to support additional days off for their reserve force Soldiers while being forced to balance their ability to operate an organization? Current laws support the reserve force Soldier to a certain level, however a massive restructuring of the laws supporting reserve Soldiers must certainly be reviewed if additional yearly training days are added. Adding training days, gaining employer support, and changing the laws are a few of the competing requirements in an operational reserve, but there is still the question of continuous requirements. What are the competing requirements for designing an operational reserve force and can the reserves meet continuous requirements in Iraq, Afghanistan,

future conflicts, and theater security cooperation missions, while supporting the Army leadership force structure vision?

The Future of the Reserves

General James Thurman, Forces Command (FORSCOM) Commanding General, lays out the future requirements of the Army Reserve in the FORSCOM Campaign Plan 2011-2015. The Army Reserve leadership must deal with three fundamental issues to make the Operational Reserve a reality. First is defining the requirements for the reserve forces for the 21st century while fulfilling the current operational demands. Second is to develop a focused vision by which to rally the reserve forces' leadership in order to affect change throughout the organization. Finally, the leadership must develop and follow a blueprint or model that facilitates major organizational change, positions the reserve forces for service into the 21st century, and ensures the successful integration of the reserve forces into the Department of Defense strategic plan.

How does the Army Reserve leadership deal with the uncertainty created with the downsizing of reserve requirements? One should begin with a review of Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Pam 525-3-1, The United States Army Operating Concept (AOC), 2016-2028, and the guidance set forth for organizing, training, equipping and conducting land operations. TRADOC is responsible for looking into the future, predicting the environment where our military forces could be expected to operate, and developing a vision and how the army will operate in the next ten to 15 years.

TRADOC sets forth a framework for force development from ideas introduced in the Army Capstone Concept (ACC), and these ideas are incorporated into the AOC. Within the AOC there are eight assumptions that define the character of future conflicts

and how future enemies will fight. Assumption #6 says “The Army will continue to employ the Army National Guard and Army Reserve on a routine basis as part of its operational forces.”²⁹ Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, directed follow on planning for operationalizing the reserve forces via guidance contained in Department of Defense Directive 1200.17, “The Reserve Components provide operational capabilities and strategic depth to meet U.S defense requirements across the full spectrum of conflict including under sections 12301, 12302, 12304, and 12306 of Reference (a).³⁰” These directives were formulated as part of DOD policy for guidance when using or directing the use of reserve forces. Each of the directives is specific in nature and requires a cap on forces and mandates for civilian leadership. Directive 12301, “Requires declaration of War or National Emergency by the Congress, it requires Congress to be in Session, it includes all Reservists including members in an inactive status and retired members, there is no number limitation stated, and for the duration of war or emergency + 6 months.”³¹

Directive 12302 is slightly different than 12301 in that 12301 is a full mobilization and 12302 is a partial mobilization. 12302 requires “a report to congress every 6 months, involves the ready reserve only, is for no more than one million reservists, and can be no longer than two years duration.”³² These directives have been established for awhile and may have been more appropriate when large amounts of troops were needed to support WWII, Korea, or even Vietnam. However, it may be time to revisit these directives and make it smoother for the reserve forces to integrate and be called to active duty for shorter duration.

The second part of the Directive states “The Active Component (ACs) and RCs are integrated as a total force based on the attributes of the particular component and individual competencies.”³³ Meaning the forces will no longer be managed separately or independently but will exist as a transparent, cohesive entity so that each entities strengths can best be used in supporting the needs of U.S. national security and policy objectives. These national security and policy objectives have many of their origins in the January 31, 2008, Commission of the National Guard and Reserves document and influence key policies coming from the Department of Defense in managing the reserve component.

The commission highlighted 95 recommendations for enhancing the reserve component and the requirements for developing a force capable of meeting the training and readiness requirements for operationalization. However, the commission also walks carefully through the process because there is reason to believe not everyone supports the continued use of the reserve forces in an operational capacity. There are many who believe we have simply defaulted into an operational reserve force simply because of the current and projected needs of ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Commission however sees fault in this logic and is not convinced the American public and their elected representatives are ready to stand behind an operational reserve force.³⁴

According to the commission, for these landslide recommendations to take hold, policy makers must clearly define the environment that defines the reserve forces. The definition must address the issues of missions, deployments, and a level of predictability for the Soldiers, their employers, and their families. With some answers to these

questions, the policy makers can affect the needed changes in laws, policies, force structure, and requirements for the reserve forces. Some of that change is already starting to appear as Congress demonstrates its commitment to the reserves by addressing the National Guard and Reserve issues through its recent passage of the 2008 National Defense Authorization Act. The Act was comprehensive in incorporating most of the Commission's March 1 recommendations. The still unanswered question will be if employers and families willingly support these operational requirements, and if the elected leaders put the money where the guidance is.

While the debate will continue to exist, the evolution of the army reserve forces from a Strategic Reserve focused force, to an Operational Force, will remain a complex and highly charged issue. The Department of Defense will continue to drive the force structure debate in the halls of the Pentagon and the guardsman and reservists will continue to serve no matter how they are defined. But make no mistake about it, the reserve forces prior to 9/11 are no longer interested in going back to their old ways. They want to remain an active part of the operational force; they are keenly interested in their future roles and missions, and expect to remain a viable contributor towards the total force. More is expected by today's traditional reservist, not less, and we as a country should not force them to go backwards after we have made such significant gains. We must operationalize the reserves, effective immediately.

Endnotes

¹ Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, A Report to the Honorable Robert Gates, January 31, 2008, 3.

² Secretary of the Army, *The Independent Panel Review of Reserve Component Employment in an Era of Persistent Conflict* (Washington DC: Chief of Staff of the Army, November 2, 2010), 62.

³ Ibid.

⁴ U.S Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations*, Version 3.0 (Washington, DC: U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, January 15, 2009), 29.

⁵ John Nagel and Travis Sharp, "Operational for What, The Future of the Guard and Reserves," *Joint Forces Quarterly* 59, (4th Quarter): 22.

⁶ GEN J.N. Mathis, Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command, *The Joint Operating Environment*, (Suffolk, VA. February 2010), 22.

⁷ Secretary of the Army, *The Independent Panel Review of Reserve Component Employment in an Era of Persistent Conflict*, 62.

⁸ Nagel and Sharp, "Operational for What," 23.

⁹ Ibid., 23.

¹⁰ Secretary of the Army, *The Independent Panel Review of Reserve Component Employment in an Era of Persistent Conflict*, 55.

¹¹ John D. Winkler, "Developing an Operational Reserve: A Policy and Historical Context and the Way Forward," *JFQ* 59, 1.

¹² John Nagel and Travis Sharp, "An Indispensable Force: Investing in America's National Guard and Reserves," *Center for New American Security* (September 2010): 6.

¹³ Secretary of the Army, *The Independent Panel Review of Reserve Component Employment in an Era of Persistent Conflict*, 51.

¹⁴ LTG James J. Lovelace, "Building Strategic Depth For an Era of Persistent Conflict," *Army* 57, 10 (Oct 2007): 206.

¹⁵ Nagel and Sharp, "An Indispensable Force: Investing in America's National Guard and Reserves," 11.

¹⁶ Secretary of the Army, *The Independent Panel Review of Reserve Component Employment in an Era of Persistent Conflict*, 47.

¹⁷ Ibid, 53.

¹⁸ Ibid., 53.

¹⁹ Department of Defense DIRECTIVE, *Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force*, NUMBER 1200.17, October 29, 2008, 1.

²⁰ Lovelace, "Building Strategic Depth For an Era of Persistent Conflict," 204.

²¹ Ibid., 206.

²² Michael Hoffman, "Officials seek to keep 'operational Reserve'," ArmyTimes, November 15, 2010, 34.

²³ Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, A Report to the Honorable Robert Gates, January 31, 2008, 6.

²⁴ Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, A Report to the Honorable Robert Gates, January 31, 2008, 1.

²⁵ Department of Defense DIRECTIVE, *Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force*, NUMBER 1200.17, October 29, 2008, 4.

²⁶ "National Security Literature Review: Hudson Institute, the Cold War Period," PNSR, National Security Literature Review, DOC 1: 100810: 9.

²⁷ Secretary of the Army, *The Independent Panel Review of Reserve Component Employment in an Era of Persistent Conflict*, 49.

²⁸ SFC Jon Soucy, "Operational reserve needs new policies, base funding source, Lamont says," October 27, 2010, linked from *The National Guard Home Page* at "News," <http://www.ng.mil/archives/2010/10/102710-Lamont.aspx> (accessed October 31, 2010).

²⁹ TRADOC Pam 525-3-1, The United States Army Operating Concept, 19 AUGUST 2010, page 7.

³⁰ Department of Defense DIRECTIVE, *Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force*, 1.

³¹ Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, 3rd Quarter Briefing FY 2010, "The Seven Reserve Components," FY 2010, <http://www.defense.gov>, (accessed November 14, 2010).

³² Ibid.

³³ Department of Defense DIRECTIVE, *Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force*, NUMBER 1200.17, October 29, 2008, 1.

³⁴ Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, A Report to the Honorable Robert Gates, January 31, 2008, 6.

